

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are now pending in the application. Claims 1, 8, 13 and 15 are currently amended. Support for the foregoing amendments can be found throughout the specification, drawings, and claims as originally filed. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Ramsden et al. (EP 1006 751 A2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 calls for “determining ... whether there is congestion at a single VC-Trunk of a plurality of VC Trunks of a physical port of the receiving-end equipment”. Applicant submits that Ramsden fails to anticipate the above limitations. Ramsden at best discloses the flow control of an SDH communication link (102) (Ramsden, paragraph 30), whereas the SDH communication link (102) includes a plurality of Virtual Containers. A buffer monitor (406) monitors a frame receipt buffer (414) that receives data packets from all the Virtual Containers. In other words, Ramsden at best appears to disclose monitoring a buffer associated with all the Virtual Containers as a whole, rather than a single Virtual Container of the plurality of Virtual Containers.

Claim 1 further calls for “pausing ... a service transmission of the VC-Trunk...” Applicant submits that Ramsden fails to anticipate the above limitations. Ramsden at best discloses that “a pause frame required to be transmitted over link (102) may be incorporated into one or more Virtual Containers.” Ramsden, col. 14, Ins. 4-9. The

pause frame is inserted into the data stream (e.g. in a Virtual Container or a plurality of Virtual Containers), which is being transmitted between frame transmission buffer (411) and frame stuffing means (412), and then further transmitted to the remote switch (104). Further transmission, including all the virtual containers, from the remote switch (104) receiving the pause frame is prevented for a predetermined time or the rate of transmission from the switch (104) is temporarily reduced. Ramsden, col. 16, Ins. 52-58; col. 17, Ins. 1-27. The microprocessor (406) is inhibited (for a specified time) from effecting further transmission of data frames from port (405). Ramsden, col. 18, Ins. 17-20. In other words, although the pause frame may be transmitted in one or more virtual containers, the switch (103, 104) of Ramsden always pauses or reduces the transmission of all the Virtual Containers, rather than a single Virtual Container from all the Virtual Containers.

The Examiner asserts that the frame flag of Ramsden anticipates the VC-Trunk tag of claim 1. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner assertion.

Specifically, the frame flag of Ramsden is a marker or frame delimitator of the data frame (Ramsden, [0032], line 41). By detecting the end of the data frame currently transmitted by buffer B (buffer 414), the buffer monitor (416) of Ramsden can issue a signal to the pause frame store 420 so as to transmit a pause frame to the local Ethernet switch subsequent to the data frame. In contrast, in claim 1, the VC-Trunk tag is used for identifying the VC-Trunk which has congestion. Thus, the frame flag and the VC-Trunk tag substantially differ. Further, Applicant can find no mention of an ID that indicates a VC-Trunk of a plurality of VC Trunks in Ramsden.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-7 define over the art cited by the Examiner. Claim 8 and its dependent claims 9-12 as well as claim 13 and its dependent claims 14-17 define over the art cited by the Examiner for one or more of the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 11, 2008

By: Joseph M. Lafata/
Joseph M. Lafata, Reg. No. 37,166

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

JML/PFD/evm